

Serial No. **10/807,433**

Docket No. **RPL-0032**

Amdt. dated February 14, 2006

Reply to Office Action of September 14, 2005

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicants have submitted new claims 13-37 for consideration by the Examiner and assert that these claims do not contain any prohibited new matter. Further, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 12 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-37 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the Abstract has been objected to. Further, claims 2-5 and 8-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,531,819 (Nakahara et al.).

Abstract Objection

The Abstract has been objected to as having two paragraphs. Applicants have submitted a new Abstract to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 2-5 and 8-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakahara et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Nakahara et al. discloses a plasma display panel of a surface discharge type, which can positively generate the discharge for display while suppressing the power consumption even when the number of the electrodes is increased for attaining the high definition. A plurality of display electrode pairs are arranged in proximity with each other inside of a pair of substrates opposed to each other with a discharge gap formed therebetween. Each display electrode includes a main pattern extending in one direction, independent discharge patterns each formed for each luminous area corresponding to a display cell, and a plurality of auxiliary patterns for electrically connecting the main pattern and the discharge patterns to each other. The auxiliary patterns are higher in conductivity than the discharge patterns.

Regarding claims 1, 7 and new claim 13, Applicants submit that Nakahara et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, auxiliary metal electrodes which are formed on side transparent ITO electrodes so that they are positioned in the direction of sides of said transparent ITO electrodes which are opposite to each other, respectively, wherein the auxiliary metal electrodes are electrically separated from the metal electrodes, or an auxiliary metal electrode pair which are formed on the transparent electrode pair so that they are electrically separated from the main metal electrode pair.

The Examiner asserts that Nakahara et al. discloses auxiliary metal electrodes which are formed on side transparent ITO electrodes so that they are positioned in the direction of sides of said transparent ITO electrodes which are opposite to each other, respectively, at Fig. 6, ref. char. 4 and col. 5, lines 14-17. However, these portions merely disclose that a plurality of auxiliary patterns (Fig. 6, 4) extending the direction perpendicular to the band-shaped portion are connected to the discharge portions, respectively, of the transparent electrode. This is not auxiliary metal electrodes which are formed on said transparent ITO electrodes so that they are positioned in the direction of sides of said transparent ITO electrodes which are opposite to each other, respectively, wherein the auxiliary metal electrodes are electrically separated from the metal electrodes. In addition, Nakahara merely discloses two electrodes, a transparent electrode 2 and bus electrode 3. This is not transparent ITO electrodes, auxiliary electrodes, and metal electrodes, as recited in the claims of the present application. The auxiliary pattern 4 in Nakahara is part of the bus electrode 3.

Regarding claims 2-6, 8-12 and new claims 14-37, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 7, and 13 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Nakahara et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-37 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/807,433**

Docket No. **RPL-0032**

Amdt. dated February 14, 2006

Reply to Office Action of September 14, 2005

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-37 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FB:dlg
Date: February 14, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610